DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 613 SP 035 035

AUTHOR Davis-Wiley, Patricia
TITLE Teacher Internships: Perceptions of Various Groups--Mentoring Teachers and Interns.
PUB DATE 11 Nov 93
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, November 10-12, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Cooperating Teachers; *Extended Teacher Education Programs; Higher Education; *Internship Programs; *Mentors; Models; *Practicum Supervision; Preservice Teacher Education; Secondary Education; *Staff Role; Student Teacher Attitudes; Student Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *University of Tennessee Knoxville

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a tri-level model of supervision of secondary teaching interns at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and presents research evaluating its efficacy. The supervision model involved the following elements: (1) the university supervisor met with the interns once per week, discussing such topics as lesson planning, assessment methods, and classroom management concerns; (2) the university supervisor met with all mentoring teachers once per month to discuss the status of the interns and any problems; and (3) the university supervisor met with the assistant principal and the faculty associate to discuss the progress of the interns, prior to regular meetings with the interns and mentoring teachers. A questionnaire administered to 2 school administrators, 6 interns, and 10 mentor teachers revealed that regularly scheduled meetings with the university supervisor met their needs and were held often enough; most felt that they were reasonably informed regarding the internship experience; and respondents felt that the internship model had been well coordinated. The study concluded that clear, well-communicated, and mutually decided upon expectations for all parties concerned are a prerequisite to a successful internship program. Appendixes list required courses for the fifth-year teaching internship, outline expectations for interns and mentoring teachers, and provide copies of the questionnaires. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 367 613

Teacher Internships: Perceptions of Various Groups---

Mentoring Teachers and Interns

a paper presented at

the annual meeting of the

MID-SOUTH EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
November 11, 1993
New Orleans, Louisiana

by

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Davis-Wiley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Patricia Davis-Wiley, Ed.D.
Professor, C&I
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

SP035035

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

As a member of the Holmes Group of Colleges of Education, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK) has a 24 graduate semester hour fifth-year teaching internship (Appendix A) as part of its vehicle for elementary and secondary licensure. Academically talented students who hold or who are matriculating a bachelor's degree in related content areas are admitted to the Teacher Education Program following a rigorous admission process. Following completion of a 28 undergraduate semester hour (elementary) or a 15 semester hour (secondary) education minor (Appendices B and C, respectively), the pre-service teachers become teaching interns for a full academic year. During this fifth year, the interns are assigned to a school and apprentice under the mentorship of one or more teachers. In the fall, the interns are in the school for one-half day; in the spring, they are in the schools for the entire day, following the hours of the regular full-time classroom teacher. By the early spring, the secondary school interns have completely taken over three classes from their mentor teachers, are engaged in a fourth period "teaching related" experience, and are treated as regular faculty members in their respective schools. During this fifth professional year, the interns matriculate methods and reflective teaching courses (fall semester), complete a major action research project (spring semester), and are supervised and evaluated by the university supervisor, mentor teachers and local school administrators. In Tennessee, this fifth-year internship functions as the first year or "probationary" level on the five-step Tennessee Career Level. Following successful completion of the internship, most students elect to matriculate an additional six graduate semester hours to earn a Masters degree in either elementary or secondary education (Appendix D).

This paper will describe a tri-level model of supervision of one mixed content-area cohort of secondary interns, piloted during the 1992-1993 academic year, and present research evaluating its efficacy.

Development of expectations for interns, supervisors, administrators

During the spring of 1992, several meetings took place at the secondary school site, during which the UTK supervisor/researcher met and dialogued with the school's assistant principal (in charge of interns) and faculty associate (the liaison between the school and the university). During these meetings, the university's

guidelines, the state of Tennessee's mandates for the internship year and the school district's policies were discussed vis-à-vis responsibilities and duties of the interns, mentoring teachers, university supervisor and school administrators. As a result, a one-page statement delineating expectations for the interns and their site-based mentoring teachers was developed (Appendix E). A subsequent meeting between the university supervisor and the newly assigned mentoring teachers took place during the first week of the 1992 fall semester to discuss the document and modify it according to feedback received.

Intern supervision model

The intern supervision model at the pilot secondary school site was tri-level and is described below.

1. The university supervisor met with her cohort of interns once per week, during a time when all interns could be present. In the fall, the "activity period" was used and during the spring, the last class period of the day was the designated time. During both semesters, the supervisor was available to stay after each group period to meet with any of the interns for additional dialogue. In addition, on-campus appointments and at-home phone calls were welcomed. Weekly meeting topics included but were not limited to: reflective teaching strategies; lesson/unit planning; assessment methods; research issues; classroom management concerns; teacher-student rapport; instructional models; parent-teacher conferences; student intervention services; technical instructional support; university announcements and record keeping hints.

2. The university supervisor met with all mentoring teachers on the first Tuesday of every month during the "activity period" to discuss the status of the interns, problems, concerns of the intern-mentoring teacher relationship and to relate any information from the university concerning the interns. Consequently, any information given to one mentoring teacher was given to them all. Additional time was made available to the mentoring teachers when requested or needed and follow-up telephone conversations during the evening took place on occasion. Since the university supervisor was on site once per week, there was rarely a problem finding the opportunity for a follow-up conference. When there was, follow-up telephone conversations during the evening took place.

3. Prior to her regular meetings with the interns and mentoring teachers, the university supervisor met with the assistant principal and the faculty associate to discuss the progress of the interns. Intervention strategies for any potential problem regarding the internship was always a joint decision. Open communication between the school and the university and dual responsibility for the induction of the interns into the teaching profession was one of the major thrusts of this relationship.

Evaluation of interns

Since the university supervisor was on site at the secondary school on a weekly basis, she was able to monitor the progress of her interns both informally and formally. Drop-in visits on the interns' classes were made regularly and feedback to the interns was given freely in order to closely monitor intern progress and to signal any potential problems prior to the three formal evaluations to follow beginning in late fall and ending in the spring. Since all interns were required by the university supervisor to keep an up-to-date notebook of all daily lesson plans (approved and initialed the previous week by their respective mentoring teachers), the drop-in visits enabled the university supervisor to quickly and effectively sample teaching strategies and student activities.

Formal evaluations of the interns by the university supervisor followed a clinical supervision model: pre-conference, observation and post-conference. Following the post-conference, copies of the evaluation were shared with the intern and mentoring teacher and monitored by the faculty associate.

As part of the original covenant at the beginning of the academic year, mentoring teachers agreed to meet with their interns several times during the week to plan instruction and assessment methodologies and to discuss the progress of the interns. (All interns were required to meet with their mentoring teachers at least twice per week at a designated time and place. When needed, the university supervisor joined the intern and mentoring teacher for triad conferences.) Weekly written evaluations, following the same forms used by the university supervisor and the administrators for formal evaluation, were conducted. Interns were encouraged to share the results of these evaluations with the university supervisor on a regular basis.

The main role of the faculty associate was to function as the conduit between administration, mentoring teachers and interns. If a potential problem arose with an intern, it was the faculty associate who served in a "trouble-shooting" or mediating capacity. In addition, when the university supervisor needed to convey information to either the mentoring teachers or the administration between regular meetings, the faculty associate was available and willing to assist in this endeavor.

Methodology

The instrument

In a effort to document the efficacy of the above described secondary intern supervision model, the researcher/university supervisor developed an open-ended, tri-level questionnaire (Appendices F,G and H) which was administered during the late spring of 1993 to the two school administrators, six interns and their 10 mentor teachers.

Data analysis

The data for each group of respondents were read and categorized by respondent group and by question. Commonalities and differences amongst responses for all three groups (interns, mentoring teachers and administrators) are reported under the Results section of this paper.

Results

Respondents agreed on the following:

1. They all felt that the regularly-scheduled meeting with the university supervisor met their needs, was held often enough and was long enough in duration.

2. None of the respondents expressed the desire to meet outside of the regularly-scheduled (during the school day) meeting time.

3. All respondents appreciated attending meetings held on-site.

4. All three groups preferred that information regarding the internship year be in both written and oral format.

5. Most felt that they were kept reasonably informed regarding their expectations for the internship experience.

6. Interns, mentoring teachers and administrators felt that the internship model had been well co-ordinated.

Varied responses to questions concerned the interactions between the mentoring teachers and the interns. Four of the six interns had a very positive relationship with their mentoring teachers and described it as being "helpful and positive." For two interns the relationship with their second mentoring teachers was reported as being negative "because she (the mentoring teacher) chose to be less involved in the overall program" and another mentoring teacher "was involved in too many other projects."
Concerning relaying feedback to each respective group from meetings with interns and mentoring teachers, mentoring teachers felt that "it helped us know that we could help them" and the interns appeared to be "very open to help and suggestions in addition to being organized."

Over all suggestions and comments from the respondents are summarized below.

Interns

One intern felt that "more compatibility is needed between interns and co-operative (mentoring) teachers over-all." Another intern suggested "make sure that all teachers are willing to have an

intern from the beginning"and continued to say that she "was less accepted in...(her) department" because she wasn't wanted. Other interns reported "things were fine as is" and that the university supervisor's "format is the most helpful part of the internship....All interns deserve this type of supervision.

Mentoring teachers

Most felt that the format used for supervision "was wonderful--we were able to discuss concerns and successes; we had feedback--so did the interns". One mentoring teacher reported "we are expected to give feedback to our students about their progress. It is only right that UT be involved to give feedback to both interns and teachers!" There was one concern that it was sometimes burdensome to get someone to fill in for him/her during the homeroom period during with the monthly meeting took place. Still another "liked having more co-ordination from the university supervisor."

Administrators

Although both administrators were pleased with the supervisory model used at their school, one expressed "concern...that UT folks understand the administrator's perspective of the intern program. It is a lot of extra work for us---if done correctly." One administrator felt that the university supervisor had "done a terrific job. She was always available to the interns and the teachers. The regular meetings with each group provided adequate time for feedback and questions." A suggestion was made for having a meeting during the summer (prior to the internship) with all UT interns, school site administrators and mentor teachers "to facilitate a smoother introduction."

Conclusion

Based on the results of this study, the researcher is encouraged by the tri-level administration model developed and implemented during the 1992-1993 academic year. Suggestions and comments made on the research instrument have been implemented into the 1993-1994 supervision model. The results of this study only further corroborate what research documents regarding the supervision of teachers-in-training. Clear, well-communicated and mutually-decided upon expectations for all parties concerned are a pre-requisite to a successful internship program.

Bibliography

Cohn, H. M & Gellman, V.C. (1988). Supervision: A Developmental approach for fostering inquiry in pre-service teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 2-8.

Oja, S. N. (1990-1991). The dynamics of collaboration: A collaborative approach to supervision in a five year teacher education program. Action in Teacher Education, 12(4), 11-20. (Excellent reference list.)

Oja, S. N. (1987, October). Future prospects for collaborative models of teacher education: A collaborative approach to leadership in supervision. Paper presented at the fall conference of the Regional Holmes Group, Boston, MA.

Oja, S. N. (1988, February). Mentoring: Challenges and opportunities for collaborative supervison in the University of New Hamphsire five-year teacher education program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego, CA.

Shapiro, P., Cohen, P., Wright, N. & Pollock, G. (1984). Supervision--A new approach to inservice teacher education. Education Canada, 24(3), 22-25.

#5

PROFESSIONAL YEAR - ELEMENTARY

		Credits Fall/Spring	
___	Educ. 574 "Analysis of Teaching for Professional Development"	2	
___	Educ. 575 "Professional Internship in Teaching"	4	8
___	Educ. 591 "Clinical Studies"		4
___	Educ. C&I 505 "Elementary and Middle School Teaching Methods II: Development and Application of Methods of Teaching Language Arts, Mathematics, Reading, Science, and Social Studies"	6	
	Total Credits each Semester	12	12

#6

PROFESSIONAL YEAR - SECONDARY

		Credits Fall/Spring	
___	Educ. 574 "Analysis of Teaching for Professional Development"	2	
___	Educ. 575 "Professional Internship in Teaching"	4	8
___	Educ. 591 "Clinical Studies"		4
___	Educ. C&I 453, 454, 455, 456, 459, 460, *461, 475, 485, 486, 495, 496 (choose 3 hours in subject area of primary certification and 3 hours as approved by advisor.	6	
	Total Credits each Semester	12	12

***All Interns must select Ed. C&I 461**

NOTE: Teacher licensure is granted at the successful completion of the Professional Year. Twelve (12) additional credits may be taken after the conclusion of the Professional Year to complete a Master's degree.

#3

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION MINOR

		CREDITS
___	Educ. and Counseling Psychology 210 "Psychology of Human Growth and Development"	3
___	Educ. C&I 324 "Applications of Instructional Technology in Elementary and Middle School Teaching"	1
___	Educ. C&I 351 "Laboratory and Field Studies in Elem. Education"	1
___	Educ. C&I 356 "Elementary and Middle School Teaching Laboratory Experience"	1
___	Educ. C&I 422 "Elementary and Middle School Teaching Methods I: Lang. Arts, Mathematics, Reading, Science, Social Studies"	6
___	Library & Information Science (Children's Literature 330)	3
___	Art Education 301, Music Education 300, Health Education 306 or Phy.Ed.Methods (HPSS 335) (choose two or more areas)	6
___	Education 400 "Professional Studies: Teachers, Schools, and Society"	2
___	Education 401 "Professional Studies: The Learner"	3
___	Education 403 "Professional Studies: Teaching & Curriculum"	2
	Total Credits	28

NOTE: All of the above mentioned classes require admission to the Teacher Education program (see #7) with the exception of Ed. Psy. 210, L&IS 30, and Art Ed. 301.

#4

SECONDARY EDUCATION MINOR

		Credits
___	Educ. & Counseling Psychology 210 "Psychology of Human Growth & Development"	3
___	Educ. C&I 352 "Field Experience in Teaching"	1
___	Educ. C&I 355 "Introduction to the Secondary Schools"	3
___	Educ. 400 "Professional Studies: Teachers, School and Society"	2
___	Educ. 401 "Professional Studies: The Learner"	3
___	Educ. 403 "Professional Studies: Teaching and Curr."	2
___	Educ. C&I 304 "Microcomputers and Instructional Design"	1
	Total Credits	15

NOTE: All of the above mentioned classes require admission to the Teacher Education program (see #7) with the exception of Ed. Psy. 210.

APPENDIX C

MASTERS PROGRAM
M.S. FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION
TRACK II

FALL SEMESTER

C&I 455	Teaching of Foreign Languages, Grades 7-12	(3)
C&I 461	Developing Reading Skills in Content Fields	(3)
Ed. 574	Analysis of Teaching	(2)
Ed. 575	Internship	(4)
		12 hrs.

SPRING SEMESTER

Ed. 575	Internship	(8)
Ed. 591	Clinical Studies	(4)
		12 hrs.

SUMMER SEMESTER

C&I 517	Current Trends and Issues	(3)
C&I 5_ _	His., Philos. of Education or:	
	Curr. Eval/Pgm. Dev./ H.S. Curriculum	(3)
Language 4/5_ _		(3)
Language 4/5_ _		(3)
		12 hrs.

TOTAL PROGRAM HOURS: 36 SEMESTER HOURS

ADVISOR: DR. PATTIE DAVIS-WILEY CLAXTON 218 UT KNOXVILLE KNOXVILLE TN 37996-3400 PH 974-2431

FARRAGUT HIGH SCHOOL
UT INTERNS/MENTORING TEACHER RESPONSIBILITIES
DR. P. DAVIS-WILEY, UT MENTORING PROFESSOR

INTERNS	TEACHERS
FIRST SIX WEEKS:	
Weeks 1 and 2:	
- observe first class to take over	- do one formal observation per week; share w/intern
- plan integration of curriculum with instruction with mentor teacher	- provide structure to intern
- learn building--who does what	- provide tour of building
- get involved in learning building and school routine	- allow intern to serve as aid to instruction
- begin UT structured observations	caution: interns are not "slaves"!
- begin "team-teaching" if ready	- begin "team-teaching" if intern ready
Weeks 3 and 4:	
- observe other subject areas (at all levels, if possible)	- continue weekly formal observations
- finish UT structured observations	- help arrange "shadow" experiences of faculty, administrators, students
- begin "shadow" experiences	
- continue to "phase into" teaching first class	
BY START OF 7TH WEEK, (OCT. 6):	
- take over first class	- "phase out' of being in room full-time
	- suggestion: allow intern first three days alone
	- continue weekly formal observations
BY NOVEMBER 18TH:	
- take over second class	- "phase-in" of second mentor teacher
	- continue weekly formal observations
BY JANUARY 18TH:	
- take over third class	- continue weekly formal observations

BY MARCH 1ST:

- begin 4th period "teaching related" assignment; (This is not necessarily a 4th class; assignment will be negotiated between the intern, school administration and UT mentoring professor.)

MEETING TIMES FOR FARRGUT MENTOR TEACHERS AND DAVIS-WILEY: 10:30-11:00, EVERY 2ND TUESDAY; INTERNS AND DAVIS-WILEY: 10:30-11:00, EVERY TUESDAY EXCEPT 2ND TUESDAY (THAT WEEK - TBA, PERHAPS THURSDAY); MEET IN CURRICULUM OFFICE, 2ND FLOOR

FARRAGUT HIGH SCHOOL
1992-93 INTERNSHIP YEAR EVALUATION
ADMINISTRATORS

This year, The University of Tennessee supervisor piloted a new model for intern supervision. She met with the site school administrators and faculty associates the spring preceding the internship year to discuss responsibilities for: faculty associates; mentor teachers; university supervisor; and school site administrator(s). All information was disseminated to and agreed upon by all parties prior to the fall semester. Interns also met with the building principal prior to the fall semester.

The university supervisor met with the mentor teachers (as a group) throughout the school year, regularly, every three to four weeks; she also met with the interns (as a group) on an average of every two weeks. Formal (including pre and post-conferences) and informal evaluations occurred throughout the academic year.

The differences of the above model from previous UT intern supervision are that the university supervisor established with the site school administrators, faculty associates and interns a and interactive and visible presence at the school site throughout the academic year.

Please answer the following questions regarding the effectiveness of the above new supervision model. Please return your survey to the curriculum principal's secretary, Ms. Hill, by Thursday, May 13, 1993. Thank you.

1. Do you feel that you had a good working-relationship with the UT supervisor this past year? If yes, please ellaborate.

2. Were you satisfied with this year's UT supervision pilot model? If yes, in which way(s)? If no, why not?

3. What changes would you suggest regarding the UT supervisor's contact with:
   the interns:
   the mentor teachers:
   administrators:

4. What problems occurred this past year between:

   the interns and you?

   the mentor teachers and interns?

   the mentor teachers and you?

5. Please suggest changes for the UT intern supervision model.

6. Additional comments:

FARRAGUT HIGH SCHOOL
1992-1993 INTERNSHIP YEAR EVALUATION
MENTOR TEACHERS

1. Has the regularly-scheduled meeting with the university supervisor met your needs?

2. Would you prefer the mentor teacher-UT supervisor meeting to occur more often? less often? or was it fine as scheduled?

3. Was the time allotted for the above meeting enough time? If not, please suggest another meeting length.

4. Would you prefer the above meeting to occur during the school day (we met during the activity period? If not, when?

5. Were you kept reasonable well-informed regarding UT's internship/mentor teacher expectations by the UT supervisor?

6. When information regarding the internship year was given to you by the UT supervisor, would you prefer that it be in an oral? written? or oral and written format?

7. Did you find it helpful to have the UT supervisor relay to you feedback from her meetings with the interns?

8. Did you feel that you were adequately informed regarding your responsibilities for working with the interns?

9. Did you find the interns' interactions with you to be a positive experience? If not, why not?

10. Suggestions for changes to the supervision of interns at Farragut H.S.:

11. Other comments:

APPENDIX G

FARRAGUT HIGH SCHOOL
1992-1993 INTERNSHIP YEAR EVALUATION
INTERNS

1. Has the regularly-scheduled meeting with the university supervisor met your needs?

2. Would you prefer the intern-UT supervisor meeting to occur more often? less often? or was it fine as scheduled?

3. Was the time allotted for the above meeting enough time? If not, please suggest another meeting length.

4. Would you prefer the above meeting to occur during the school day (we met during the activity period? If not, when?

5. Were you kept reasonable well-informed regarding UT's internship/mentor teacher expectations by the UT supervisor?

6. When information regarding the internship year was given to you by the UT supervisor, would you prefer that it be in an oral? written? or oral and written format?

7. Did you find it helpful to have the UT supervisor relay to you feedback from her meetings with the mentor teachers?

8. Did you feel that the mentor teachers were adequately informed regarding their expectations for the internship experiences?

9. Did you find the mentor teachers' interactions with you to be a positive experience? If not, why not?

10. Suggestions for changes to the supervision of interns at Farragut H.S.:

11. Other comments:

APPENDIX H